

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-10, 12-14, 16 and 19 are pending in this application. Claims 8, 10 and 12-14 are amended, and claim 19 is newly added. Claims 8 and 14 are independent.

Initially, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the Applicant's claim for priority and the receipt of the foreign priority document and English translation thereof. Applicant respectfully notes that Private PAIR labels these documents as "Miscellaneous Incoming Letter" and shows these documents as being received on February 28, 2002. Further, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner acknowledge the acceptance of the formal drawings, which were also filed on February 28, 2002 and are labeled as "Miscellaneous Incoming Letter" in Private PAIR.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the references included in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 28, 2002 and March 5, 2002 have been acknowledged as considered by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-10, 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tolino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,654,702, herein Tolino) in view of Qureshi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,077, herein Qureshi). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the following reasoning.

Claims 8-10, 12 and 13

Amended independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “a translational rail on one end of the inspection device, wherein the video camera and lighting arrangement are mounted on the translational rail so as to be movable in translational motion along said translational rail.”

Applicant respectfully submits that at least this feature of amended independent claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

The Office Action mailed April 5, 2006 (page 3, lines 15-17) acknowledges that Tolino “is silent in regards to, a translational rail on one end of the inspection device, wherein the video camera and lighting arrangement are mounted on the translational rail so as to be movable in translational motion.” However, the Examiner then asserts that “such features are well known and used in remote visual inspection as evidenced in Qureshi ‘077 (figs. 4-8), which shows a remote visual inspection device, including rotatable camera 48 (col. 1, lines 65-66) and lightening 49 and 50 are mounted on the translational rail (39, i.e., gimbal support or carrier) that enabled more precise remote visual inspection of the internal surfaces.”¹

However, Applicant respectfully notes that Qureshi only describes a camera carrier mount 39 that is capable of rotating a camera and thus, the camera carrier or mount 39 does not disclose, teach or suggest any translational rail that enables a video camera and lighting arrangement to be moved along said translational rail in a translational motion. In particular, Qureshi states (column 3, lines 34-38) that “[t]he camera carrier or mount 39 has a construction similar to a gimbal and is capable of rotating approximately 270° about an axis 45 that intersects and is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the lead and segment 31.”

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that even if Tolino and Qureshi are

¹ Office Action mailed April 5, 2006, page 3, lines 18-23.

combinable, which the Applicant does not admit, the Examiner's proposed combination of Tolino and Qureshi would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest "a translational rail on one end of the inspection device, wherein the video camera and lighting arrangement are mounted on the translational rail so as to be movable in translational motion along said translational rail," as recited in amended independent claim 8. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 10, 12 and 13, which depend from amended independent claim 8, are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 8-10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 16

Amended independent claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, "a self-supporting, telescopically extendable C-shaped rail including a plurality of curved telescopic segments, by way of which the carrying framework is capable of traveling, wherein said C-shaped rail is designed to move said carrying framework through an annular combustion chamber." Applicant respectfully submits that at least this feature patentably distinguishes amended independent claim 14 and dependent claim 16 over the cited references.

The Office Action mailed April 5, 2006 (page 4, lines 15-16) acknowledges that Tolino "is silent in regards to, 'telescopically' extendable C-shaped rail." However, the Examiner asserts that "Qureshi '077 (i.e., figs. 4-6, arms 31-35 of Qureshi) teaches a self-supporting telescopically extendable flexible arms, which are adjustable to different shape and position, which enhances flexibility of the inspection device for inspecting of difficult access locations."

However, as shown in FIGs. 1-6 of Qureshi, Qureshi only discloses a series of articulated linear segments 31-36 connected by joints 37 (see col. 3, lines 16-20). Further, because the inspection apparatus described in Qureshi is designed to inspect a non-annular tank, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to provide a C-shaped rail absent impermissible hindsight analysis using the Applicant's own disclosure. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully notes that the gimbal camera carrier 39 mounted on the leading end of the articulated arm 21 is not a "carrying framework" as recited in amended independent claim 14.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that even if Tolino and Qureshi are combinable, which the Applicant does not admit, the Examiner's proposed combination of Tolino and Qureshi would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest, "a self-supporting, telescopically extendable C-shaped rail including a plurality of curved telescopic segments, by way of which the carrying framework is capable of traveling, wherein said C-shaped rail is designed to move said carrying framework through an annular combustion chamber" as recited in amended independent claim 14. Claim 16 depends from claim 14 and thus, is allowable for the same reasons as amended independent claim 14.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claim 19

New claim 19 depends from amended independent claim 14 and thus, is in condition for formal allowance at least based on the same reasoning as discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections and allowance of each of the pending claims of the present application is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: _____


Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/SAE:ame

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000